

EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency Washington, DC 20460 Work Assignment						Work Assignment Number 1-01			
						<input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment Number:			
Contract Number EP-W-11-020		Contract Period 02/01/2011 To 01/31/2013 Base Option Period Number 1				Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name DER Production			
Contractor CAMBRIDGE ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.				Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW Section III Task A					
Purpose: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Close-Out <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Incremental Funding <input type="checkbox"/> Work Plan Approval						Period of Performance From 02/01/2012 To 01/31/2013			
Comments: In accordance with contract clause B.2 "Work Assignments", please submit two (2) copies of a work plan to the Project Officer (PO) and one (1) copy to the Contracting Officer (CO) within fourteen (14) calendar days after receipt of this work assignment initiation. The work plan shall include a detailed technical and staffing plan with incorporated QA elements and a detailed cost estimate.									
<input type="checkbox"/> Superfund Accounting and Appropriations Data						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Superfund			
Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations data use EPA Form 1900-69A.									
SFO (Max 2) <input type="checkbox"/>									
Line	DCN (Max 6)	Budget/FY (Max 4)	Appropriation Code (Max 6)	Budget Org/Code (Max 7)	Program Element (Max 9)	Object Class (Max 4)	Amount (Dollars) (Cents)	Site/Project (Max 8)	Cost Org/Code (Max 7)
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling									
Contract Period:		Cost/Fee:		LOE: 0					
02/01/2011 To 01/31/2013									
This Action:				16,400					
Total:				16,400					
Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals									
Contractor W/P Dated:				Cost/Fee:		LOE:			
Cumulative Approved:				Cost/Fee:		LOE:			
Work Assignment Manager Name Brian Montague						Branch/Mail Code:			
_____						Phone Number 703-305-6438			
(Signature) _____ (Date) _____						FAX Number:			
Project Officer Name Brian Montague						Branch/Mail Code:			
_____						Phone Number: 703-305-6438			
(Signature) _____ (Date) _____						FAX Number:			
Other Agency Official Name Jennifer Garger						Branch/Mail Code:			
_____						Phone Number: 202-564-0844			
(Signature) _____ (Date) _____						FAX Number:			
Contracting Official Name Jody Gosnell						Branch/Mail Code:			
_____						Phone Number: 202-564-4353			
(Signature) _____ (Date) 1-27-12						FAX Number:			

Contract #EP-W-11-020
Work Assignment # EP-1-01
Statement of Work

I. Title: Review and Evaluation of Individual Effects, Fate, and Transport Studies

IIa. Project Officer: (COR Certificate Expires: 10/01/12)

Brian Montague (7507P)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460

IIb. Alternate Project Officer: (COR Certificate Expires: 10/01/12)

Derek Scott(7507P)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460

III. Work Assignment Manager: (COR Certificate Expires: 10/01/12)

Brian Montague (7507P)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460

IV. Period of Performance: February 1, 2011 - January 31, 2012.

V. Level of Effort: 16,400 hrs.

VI. Background:

EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) as required by the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) as amended by the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) of 1996, is responsible for the regulation of pesticides through the registration, registration review and reregistration of pesticides. OPP develops data requirements and guidelines for the conduct of studies by registrants that are used, along with other data and information, to assess the potential impact of the use of the pesticide on human health and the environment. Before EPA can use studies and data in assessing risk, these data must be evaluated to determine their adequacy and validity and to ensure that appropriate quality assurance procedures were carried out. Once data have been evaluated and determined to be acceptable and valid, these data are used to assess risk to human health and ecological resources. OPP also convenes scientific workshops and seminars to discuss and resolve scientific issues associated with the registration, registration review and reregistration of pesticides.

VII. Scope of Work:

Under Task A of the Contract's Statement of Work, the Contractor shall provide support primarily in the area of review and evaluation of available data pertaining to the effects, chemistry, and fate of pesticides in the environment (including the evaluation of environmental monitoring data), assessing environmental risk from pesticides, and the assessment of pesticide effects, fate, and transport in the environment.

The Contractor shall upon request by EPA, collect data from the open literature or from other sources designated by EPA and shall review these data as well as all other effects, fate, and transport studies provided to the Contractor by EPA. The reviews shall: (1) evaluate individual studies of environmental fate processes and will identify any variance from published guidelines/standard evaluation practices/data review guidelines, etc., (2) evaluate environmental monitoring data and characterize the nature and extent of measured contamination, and, (3) evaluate data from the open literature when specifically requested by EPA. The data requirements to support registration or registration review are delineated in 40 CFR part 158, Guidelines for Registering Pesticides in the United States 1982, Subpart N and other applicable documents.

The Work Assignment Manager (WAM) or Project Officer (PO) will make available to the Contractor the data, studies (data evaluation record (DER)), and information which is to be reviewed, with the occasional exceptional circumstance where the Project Officer requests that the Contractor collect and aggregate extant environmental monitoring data or fate and transport studies from open literature. The studies and data will be provided in printed form (originals or reprints of each study) and/or electronic form. Due dates for each data package and/or assessment and/or project shall be negotiated between the Project Officer (Agency) and the Project Manager (the Contractor).

The Contractor will fully substantiate and document all work efforts in this regard so that EPA may critically analyze and approve/disapprove any recommendation, options, alternatives or courses of action flowing from the Contractor's work effort.

Communications shall take place as necessary to resolve technical, format and entry questions. Communication may be via phone calls, FAX, E-mail, and/or other types of progress reports. Face-to-face meetings or conference calls will be held as deemed necessary.

VIII. Deliverables:

As mentioned in the Scope of Work, the due date will be negotiated between the Project Officer (EPA/EFED) and the Project Manager (Contractor). A standard review of a study generally takes eight weeks after receipt to complete. However, on occasion, the Contractor will be required to perform an enhanced review. This enhanced review will require that the due date and/or schedules be changed or accelerated. Enhanced review of studies and data is required under Section 33 of FIFRA (as added by subsection (f)(2) of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003).

All review DERs shall be delivered by courier or Federal Express. Deliverables shall be a hardcopy and on a CD. A hardcopy of the associated Green Sheet shall also accompany the DER. Each CD shall include the DER and Electronic data entry into the Eco and Fate DBs for

the particular work assignment only, i.e., per chemical. When necessary, deliverables will be accepted via email.

Quality Criteria:

The contractor shall submit all deliverables in Microsoft Word ® and Excel. All tables, graphs, diagrams, etc. shall be developed using programs that allow for them to be easily imported into, and edited within, Microsoft Word ® and Excel. All deliverables shall be clearly written, concise, and free of spelling and grammatical errors. (Note: Although EFED understands that there are nuances in spelling and grammar that may prevent documents from being 100% error free, there must be evidence that, at a minimum, a spell and grammar check was run, and that the Contractor made an honest effort to produce error-free deliverables for EFED.)

Unless otherwise stated in a technical direction SOW, EFED's minimum data quality criteria are 1) > 95% accuracy in all data summarization table entry, where all values and their accompanying units entered by the contractor into the summarization tables match exactly with those in the source data (e.g. DERs) 2) >95% accuracy between text and data tables, so that any values and their units referenced in the text are identical to those that appear in the data summarization tables, and 3) all relevant data and interpretation thereof correspond to the format and language style of any example(s) provided, to the extent instructed by EFED.

It is expected that the contractor shall approach each assignment as being unique; therefore, wherever examples, template, formats, etc. have been provided, the contractor shall generally follow them in such a way to ensure that all salient points pertaining to the particular chemical being assessed are included or added, while excluding irrelevant or impertinent points.

IX. Reporting Requirements:

14
A Work Plan shall be submitted within 15 days of receipt of the approved Work Assignment as required in the contract. A final Work Plan shall be submitted within 5 days of receiving comments on a proposed Work Plan. A Work Plan is a formal document describing in comprehensive detail the necessary technical activities, staffing requirements, and QA/QC activities that shall be implemented to ensure that the results of the work performed will satisfy the needs and quality criteria identified in the Work Assignment and this Technical Direction. The staffing plan shall be written in accordance with all applicable elements (i.e. A1-A9, B9, B10, C1-C2, and D1-D3) of the EPA/QA R-5 document, EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans, in consultation with the EPA/QA G-5 guidance document (USEPA, 2001; 2002). Within the staffing plan, the contractor shall clearly identify any points of clarification or additional information needed, which were not already addressed in the SOW. This work plan shall also clearly indicate the contractor's proposed staffing levels and cost estimates for the work to be performed under this technical direction. The contractor shall indicate any proposed modifications to the time frames specified by EFED, with reasons for the proposed changes.

Written monthly progress reports shall include a detailed breakdown of costs and hours by task, and a description of tasks which were initiated or completed, and any problems which arose, as required in the contract.

X. Schedule of Deliverables:

Work Plan	14 days after receipt of WA
Revised Work Plan	5 days after receipt of comments
Review of DERs	See Section VIII above

XI. Travel:

No travel is anticipated

XII. Management Controls:

All duplication shall be in accordance with clause H.2 (Printing) of the contract. All technical direction shall be issued by the WAM in accordance with clause H.21 of the contract.

16

EPAUnited States Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC 20460**Work Assignment**

Work Assignment Number

1-01

☐ Other ☐ Amendment Number:

Contract Number

EP-W-11-020

Contract Period 02/01/2011 To 01/31/2013

Base

Option Period Number 1

Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name

Review and Evaluation

Contractor

CAMBRIDGE ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.

Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW

Task A

Purpose:

☐

Work Assignment

☐

Work Assignment Close-Out

☐

Work Assignment Amendment

☐

Incremental Funding

☒

Work Plan Approval

Period of Performance

From 02/01/2012 To 01/31/2013

Comments:

The purpose of this action is to approve the Contractors Work Plan and Cost Estimate dated 02/01/12 for 15,550 hours at a cost of \$1,350,958.93.

☐

Superfund

Accounting and Appropriations Data

☒

Non-Superfund

Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations data use EPA Form 1900-69A.

SFO
(Max 2)☐

Line	DCN (Max 6)	Budget/FY (Max 4)	Appropriation Code (Max 6)	Budget Org/Code (Max 7)	Program Element (Max 9)	Object Class (Max 4)	Amount (Dollars)	(Cents)	Site/Project (Max 8)	Cost Org/Code (Max 7)
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										

Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling

Contract Period:

Cost/Fee: \$0.00

LOE:

02/01/2011 To 01/31/2013

This Action:

\$0.00

Total:

\$0.00

Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals

Contractor WP Dated: 02/01/2012

Cost/Fee: \$1,350,958.93

LOE: 15,550

Cumulative Approved:

Cost/Fee: \$1,350,958.93

LOE: 15,550

Work Assignment Manager Name Brian Montague

Branch/Mail Code:

Phone Number 703-305-6438

FAX Number:

(Signature)

(Date)

Project Officer Name Brian Montague

Branch/Mail Code:

Phone Number: 703-305-6438

FAX Number:

(Signature)

(Date)

Other Agency Official Name

Branch/Mail Code:

Phone Number:

FAX Number:

(Signature)

(Date)

Contracting Official Name Jody Gosnell

Branch/Mail Code:

Phone Number: 202-564-4353

FAX Number:

(Signature)

(Date)